DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 360 HE 001 274

AUTHOR	Benovich, Joseph B.; And Others
TITLE	Report of the President's Committee On Student Involvement in the University.
PUB DATE	16 May 69
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration, *Governance, *Governmental Structure, *Higher Education, Policy Formation, *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Cleveland State University

ABSTRACT

Originally established to consider expanded faculty and student involvement in the governance of Cleveland State University, the Committee decided to recommend changes within the existing governmental structure rather than encourage the establishment of a new system. Background material was studied, meetings were held and 2 questionnaires were administered--one to deans, departmental chairmen and various other academic units at Cleveland State, and another to 66 universities asking for information on student involvement in governance at their institutions. The responses to the second questionnaire are tabulated. All of the universities indicated they were "rethinking" or had recently revised their policies on student involvement in governance. Brief explanations of their reasons for doing so are offered. Recommendations of the committee call for student membership on 17 university committees and representation at departmental meetings. Recommendations also include provisions for: the number of students to be included on each committee, method of selection, academic qualifications necessary, and terms of appointment. (JS)

ED035360

REPORT

of the

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

May 16, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Submitted by:

Joseph B. Benovich
Donald A. Bliss
Adeline S. Kaplar
William J. Kotraba
Thomas F. Campbell
Willian A. Patterson
Louis A. Tuzi
Delbert D. Weber, Chairman

The Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

HE001 274

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Background of Report 1

II Committee Procedures 6

III Findings and Recommendations 15

IV Selection of Student Committee Members 19

V Evaluation 22

Appendix

I BACKGROUND OF THE REPORT

In the decade of the Sixties the winds of change have blown across the campuses of American universities. The preceeding college generation -- the silent one -- has given way to one whose concerns and activities mirror the social conflicts of contemporary society. On the campus, as in the larger society, the conventional wisdom and age-encrusted practices are increasingly subject to scrutiny. The Universities themselves -- long the sanctuaries of the privileged few -- have become more and more a microcosm of our affluent society. Higher education which was once the preserve of the children of the elite is now considered a vital necessity in our complex technical society. We have seen a massive influx of students into the universities and colleges.

This influx coincided with qualitative changes in the role of our institutions of higher learning. Research and technical assistance designed to aid the economy and the national government became a significant part of the tasks before many of our faculties. The enhanced status of those engaged in such activities was reflected in the salaries and prestige accorded to the men thus engaged. Many of our universities became centers of sponsored research and the new hallmark of academic acclaim was the low or non-existant teaching load.

But at the same time thousands of students were entering our campuses. Many of our state universities resembled medium sized cities while scores of new colleges sprang up almost over night. Increasingly, graduate assistants tended to the educational needs of students to whom the famous and not so famous professors were like ships that passed in the night. In the large universities the development of a multi-layered bureaucracy further isolated the students from those who controlled their academic experience.

By 1964 there was already a trace of rebellion against the faceless nature of our mass and multiuniversities. The Berkeley disturbances of 1964 and the subsequent Berkeley Report were a revelation and confirmation of deep-rooted student dissatisfaction with the prevailing system that relegated the student to the lowest place on the academic totem pole. But the gentle breeze of change that followed was more or less forgotten until the nation became engulfed with protests over the war in Vietnam. The university teach-ins, the rise of more radical student organizations -- SNCC and SDS -- and the response of idealistic students to the increased tempo of the war brought an increased questioning of the role of the universities in the nation's business.

The changing pattern of attitudes was reflected in the condemnation of governmental agencies for the clandestine role that they had played in using student organizations, campus facilities, and foundations for the cold war struggles. As dissenting students turned inward on the structure of the universities themselves, they found much to criticize and, indeed, much to change -- a curriculum that was geared to the elitist nature of the earlier university, outmoded social regulations, and an attitude of authoritarianism that was cloaked under the guise of loco parentis. Many liberal universities were in fact centers of engrained conservativism. While a few radicals sought to destroy the system, others -- students, faculty, and administrators recognized the need for change. However, the well-established practices and the decentralized nature of power within the universities' systems made this difficult to accomplish overnight or indeed over months. Delay or indifference was the order of the day or so it seemed to the more active students.

Cleveland State University was not immune to the changes that were affecting other universities but the nature of our student body has probably prevented the sort of unrest and protest that struck other universities across the nation. Our urban located campus with its large numbers of commuting and working students was not so affected by the loco parentis system, but on the other hand it was not entirely free of some of the other practices that were drawing student ire on other campuses. While our student leadership was a relatively inexperienced and amorphous group, it did contain some students who were anxious that the university would concern itself about the restructuring of the institution. They had no desire to destroy the existing system but they sought to make it more responsive to the student component of the university community.

It was in this spirit that in the fall of 1967 the President of the Day Student Council, William J. Kotraba, aided by the faculty advisor, Professor Raymond Prada, began to explore the role of the students in governing the university. This preliminary exploration resulted in a draft proposal that called for a relatively modest involvement of Cleveland State University students in the various standing committees of the Faculty Council. Mr. Kotraba said that such a step would "bring about a more meaningful learning process between faculty and students." While he did not claim that the proposal was the only solution, he believed that it would "serve as a platform from which an acceptable and workable plan can be reached through the process of addition and deletion."

This draft proposal was examined and revised by the Executive Committee of the Day Student Council early in the winter quarter of 1968. The revised

copy was sent in March, 1968 to President Harold L. Enarson and the Deans of the several colleges of the Cleveland State University. Because this proposal, if accepted, would entail a major revision of the By-laws of the University faculty organization, President Enarson sent it to the Faculty Affairs Committee fo examination and action. This Committee met with Mr. Kotraba and engaged in a fruitful examination of the issues that his proposal had raised. Mr. Kotraba explained that he felt the time had come for students to play a larger role in the governing of the university; that this matter was being debated in almost every American campus and in some cases angry co frontations had taken place. While this was not a burning issue among his fellow students at Cleveland State University, he believed that early action by the faculty and administration could possibly prevent the "hastily drawn up patchwork quilt" measures that often came in the wake of bitter clashes and disturbances between the different segments of the universities.

After due deliberation the Faculty Affairs Committee sent the following resolution to the June meeting of the Faculty Council:

> The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the President invite the President of the Day Student Council and the President of the Evening Student Council and two other students selected by the President to attend all Faculty Council meetings as non-voting participants until an ad hoc committee composed of these four students, two members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and two representatives of the Administration provide the Faculty Council with a plan for the equitable and permanent involvement of the student body in the government of the University.

Professor Albert Cousins, chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee, accepted two amendments. One was for the inclusion of the President of the Academic Center Student Councils as one of the two other students. The other, which was of a more substantive nature, called for increased involvement of the faculty in governance of the university. The amended

resolution passed unanimously. Two days later the Faculty Affairs Committee appointed Professors Louis A. Cambell and Thomas F. Tuzi as its representatives on the proposed ad hoc committee.

Despite the directive from the Faculty Council there was some concern on the part of President Enarson about the proposed course of action. By the middle of October, 1968, no action had been taken to appoint the other members of the ad hoc committee. Mr. Kotraba, on his own initiative, arranged for a meeting with President Enarson to which were invited the Dean of Students, Dr. Evert C. Wallenfeldt, Professors Campbell and Tuzi, and the new President of the Student Council, Mr. Joseph Benovich. This meeting was fruitful and within a few days President Enarson announced the formation of the ad hoc Committee on Student and Faculty Involvement in the Governance of the University. In addition to the two faculty representatives, Professors Campbell and Tuzi, the committee was composed of Dr. Del Weber and Dr. William Patterson as representatives of the Administration. The four student representatives were as follows: Mr. Joseph Benovich, President of the Day Student Council, Mr. Donald Famera, President of the Evening Student Council, Mr. Donald Bliss from the Academic Centers, and Mr. William Kotraba. Dr. Weber was designated Chairman by President Enarson. Mrs. Adeline Kaplar replaced Mr. Famera early in the committee's deliberations.

II COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

The Committee first met on October 22, 1968 to determine what the various aspects of its charges were. Numerous questions were discussed: To whom does the committee report? Will the Committee concern itself with student involvement in both academic and non-academic affairs? Should all aspects of student involvement be considered? Should Student Councils' role in university governance be considered? What role does the Student Bill of Rights play? Should the question of faculty participation in university governance be considered by the Committee? What resource material do we have? What additional information do we need? How do we proceed with the study? - and many more.

At the first meeting and throughout its deliberations the Committee was given background material to study. This material covered various articles, books, papers, and reports from various sources within and outside of Cleveland State University.

The Committee held regular weekly two-hour sessions and carried out its charge in the following order: All administrative committees at Cleveland State University were identified and discussed to ascertain what role, if any, these play in the governance of the institution. The range of committee investigation began with the Trustees and ended with students. This was followed by two questionnaires, one sent to deans, departmental chairmen and various other academic units at Cleveland State University requesting them to list different organizations and committees presently in existance on campus. The cooperation and information received from faculty and administration

was most helpful in formulating our report. A second questionnaire entitled "Student Involvement in the University" was developed and sent to 66 pre-selected universities in America to obtain information on student involvement in the governance of those institutions. See Appendix A for the complete findings of this questionnaire.

Pertinent findings from the study are included below.

TABLE I

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THEIR UNIVERSITIES

1. Are you in process of rethinking student involvement in university affairs?

Yes 31 No 3* No Answer 2

a. In what areas?

	No. of Institutions
All Administrative & Faculty committees	11
Academic &/or Curricular	7
Student Affairs	5
Administrative	2
Departmental	2
Selection Procedures for Committee Membership	2
Buildings & Grounds	1
Student Discipline	1
Financial	1
Board of Trustees	1
Advisory-Type	1

2. Has student involvement in your committee structure in areas listed below added significantly to the governance of your institution?

	Yes	No
Curriculum	13	4
Finance	5	9
Teaching	10	6
Physical Planning	11	6
Others		
Social Regulations	6	
Co-curricular Act.	1	
Athletics	1	
Educational Services	1	
Library	1	

* These three institutions have revised their policies on the involvement of students in the governance of their universities within the past two years.

TABLE II

COMPOSITION OF FACULTY STANDING COMMITTEES WITH STUDENT REPRESENTATION

	No. of Committees with Student Representation	No. of Representatives				% of Representation			
		Stud.	Adm.	Fac.	Total	Stud.	Adm.	Fac.	Total
21 Institutions	180	557	383	1,469	2,409	23.1%	15.9%	61.0%	100.0%
4 Institutions	46	152	287		439	34.6%	65.4%		100.0%
25 Institutions	226	709	2,139		2,848	24.9%	75.1%		100.0%

				Student Role			
				Voting		Non-Voting	
				No.	%	No.	%
6 Institutions	73	168	?	?	831	94.8	46	5.2
31 Institutions	299	877						

TABLE III

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SPECIFIC FACULTY COMMITTEES

Committee Area	Number of Institutions	Institutions with Student Representatives on Committees		Stud. Representatives		Student Role	
				Total No.	Avg. per Committee	Number Voting	Number Non-Voting
		No.	%				
1. Curricular	31	13	42	39	3.0	31	8
2. Admissions and/or Standards	31	10	32	23	2.3	21	2
3. Financial Aid	31	16	52	43	2.7	40	3
4. Faculty Affairs	31	2	6	3	1.5	0	3

The committee spent considerable time developing premises which would assist it in establishing guidelines for involving students in the committee structure of the University. In many respects this was one of the most challenging aspects of our deliberations. After much debate, the committee concluded that the following assumptions were valid for the development of guidelines.

1. Committee deliberations should be limited to the matter of student involvement only. The committee did not feel that it was appropriately constituted (2 administrators, 2 faculty, and 4 students) for the important task of examining the role of faculty governance, as outlined in the original charge to the committee. Such a responsibility should be assigned to a committee with a greater faculty representation and we urge that the Faculty Council act promptly on this matter.

2. Committee recommendations should be made within the existing governmental structure of the University rather than considering establishment of a new structure.

3. Student participation should be limited to preclude judgement by students of their academic peers and students should not have access to confidential data.

4. The consideration of student participation should be limited at this time to the Faculty Council, its standing committees, and Colleges and departmental level committees. While there are many other committees on which students could effectively serve, it was the committee's judgement that there was the danger initially of creating more committee assignments for students than they could effectively staff. We urge that when the appropriate bodies evaluate this experiment, consideration be given to student involvement in administrative and trustee committees.

5. Students are such a vital part of the university community they should have an effective role to play in the governance of the institution. The direction of change in the students' role in college and universities is toward increasing the number of arrangements by which students can participate formally in making of policy decisions.

6. Student participation provides an important source of input to university governance. It can reduce the chances of misunderstanding, can provide important feedback to faculty and administration, and can, potentially, be a meaningful part of the students' education leading in turn to a greater meaning and personal relevance of the other parts of that education.

7. The students' sense of significant, effective collaboration in the making of policies that affect their education will be enhanced if their participation extends from the inception to the completion of deliberations of university policies.

Having come to the judgement that students would contribute to the more effective governance of the University, the committee developed guidelines to be used in determining the nature of student participation on each University committee. These guidelines gave consideration to the following:

Number of students to be represented
Methods of selection
Area of representation (Main-Acad-Center)
Division represented (Day - Evening)
Length of term
Educational experience required
College represented
Academic standing necessary
Previous experience in recognized CSU ( )izations

After the guidelines were established, each chairman of the University committees under consideration were invited to help the committee explore some of the issues involved in student participation. The chairmen interviewed were:

Professor Chester Topp, Chairman, Curriculum Committee
Professor Albert Cousins, Chairman, Faculty Affairs Committee
Dr. V. Richard Gulbenkian, Chairman, Admissions & Standards Committee
Professor Joseph Ink, Chairman, Coop Committee
Professor Edward S. Gadleski, Chairman, Financial Aids Committee
Mr. Alex Jamieson, Chairman, Athletic Committee
Professor John Cary, Chairman, Library Committee
Professor Ella McKee, Chairman, Student Affairs Committee
Professor Robert MacNaughton, Chairman, Committee on Honorary Degrees
Professor Fredrick Holck, Chairman, Assembly Committee
Dr. Kenneth Jenkins, Chairman, Counseling & Guidance Committee
Assistant Dean William Kerka, Chairman, College of Engineering Curriculum Committee
Associate Dean Raymond Ziegler, Chairman, College of Business Curriculum Committee

These meetings proved to be very productive as the committee members explored with the chairmen the question of student involvement in University committees. Each individual expressed his views concerning the role of student participation in general and their own committee in particular. The general view of those interviewed was the (1) students do have a role to play in University committee work and (2) they could participate productively. On the other hand, there was some expression of feeling that students should not be represented on the Faculty Affairs Committee at this time.

During the course of discussion with the chairmen, many considerations were raised. Among these were:

1. Is the nature of the committee's work such as to demand more time of the student than he can afford?

2. Is the committee assignment one which impinges directly on students? Almost exclusively on students?

3. Is the work of the committee such that it demands reasonable continuity from year to year? Is the complexity of the committee work such that it is unfeasible to attempt to orient students each year to the assignment?

4. What knowledge, background, or interest do students have for participation on the committee?

5. To what extent should students be involved -- advice? -- expression of opinion? -- voting? -- representation?

At the conclusion of each discussion with the invitees, the ad hoc committee evaluated possible student participation on the committees under consideration by applying the above mentioned criteria.

III FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this committee were arrived at after careful consideration of the guidelines outlined earlier in this report. Each university committee was considered individually taking into account the total representation of the committee, the continuity of service required by the committee, the differences in experience required for service and the academic standing which seemed necessary for the assignment.

More students proportionately were placed on those committees which affected them directly, i.e. the Student Affairs Committee. With but few exceptions it was felt that a 2.00 grade average qualified students for service on committees. Exceptions were made in those areas dealing with curriculum.

Voting status was given on all committees. It was the judgement of the committee that if students were to be active committee members, the voting rights were necessary. Moreover this was consistent with the practices of the institutions surveyed.

The number of students to be included on each committee, the academic qualifications necessary, and the length of term of appointment are not considerations which lend themselves to precise mathematical calculation. In the final analysis the conclusions reached by the committee are subjective in nature and another committee might reach different conclusions in these areas.

Recommendations for student participation in the governance of the University are outlined in Table V. Table VI indicates the composition of affected committees as presently structured and the composition of committees as recommended by the report.

TABLE V

RECOMMENDATION FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

FACULTY COMMITTEE	Number of Students	Voting Status	Length of Term	Number of Hours Earned	Academic Standing
Student Affairs	6	yes	2 years	90	2.0
Committee on Athletics	3	yes	1 year	45	2.0
Cooperative Education (one from each college)	4	yes	1 year	90	2.0
Library	1	yes	2 years	90	2.0
Committee on Honorary Degrees	1	yes	1 year	135	2.0
University Assembly	3	yes	2 years	90	2.0
Curriculum	2	yes	1 year	135	3.0
Admissions and Standards	2	yes	2 years	90	2.0
Faculty Affairs Committee	NONE	---	-----	--	--
Financial Aid	2	yes	1 year	90	2.0
Counseling and Guidance	3	yes	2 years	nomin.	nomin.
Faculty Council	4	yes	1 year	90	2.0
COLLEGE COMMITTEE					
B.A. Undergraduate Curriculum	3	yes	1 year	90	2.5
Engineering Curriculum & Instruction	3	yes	1 year	90	2.5
Education curriculum	3	yes	1 year	135	2.5
Arts & Sciences Curriculum	3	yes	1 year	90	2.5

TABLE V Continued

MAJOR FIELD DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATION	Number of Faculty	Number of Students
Students to be represented in departmental meetings except in the portions of those meetings in which confidential, personal matters pertaining to students, faculty, or administration are considered. Number of student representatives to be based on number of faculty in each department as follows:	1 - 10	2
	10 - 20	3
	20 plus	4
	Each Academic Center	4

SPECIAL COMMITTEE	Number of Students	Voting Status	Length of Term	Number of Hours Earned	Academic Standing
Faculty Affairs Advisory Committee (one from each college)	4	yes	2 years	90	2.0

TABLE VI

STUDENT PARTICIPATION ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES
1968-69

	Present Representation				Representation if recommendations of this report were in effect			
Faculty Council	Faculty	Admin.	Students	Total	Faculty	Admin.	Students	Total
Academic Steering	4	2	0	6	4	2	0	6
Curriculum	6	1	0	7	6	1	2	9
Cooperative Education	4	1	0	5	4	1	4	9
Faculty Affairs	6	1	0	7	6	1	0	7
Admissions & Standards	6	1	0	7	6	1	2	9
Athletics	6	1	0	7	6	1	3	10
Financial Aid	4	1	0	5	4	1	2	7
Honorary Degrees	4	2	0	6	4	2	1	7
Student Affairs	3	1	4	8	3	1	6	10
Counseling & Guidance	4	5	0	9	4	5	3	12
Library	7	1	0	8	7	1	1	9
University Assembly	4	0	3	7	4	0	3	7
Faculty Council	23	13	0*	36	23	13	4	40
Sub-Total	81	30	7	118	81	30	31	142
College								
Arts & Science Curriculum	6	0	0	6	6	0	3	9
B.A. Undergraduate Curriculum	5	1	0	6	5	1	3	9
Educ. Undergraduate Curriculum	3	1	0	4	3	1	3	7
Engrg. Curric. & Instr.	5	1	0	6	5	1	3	9
Sub-Total	19	3	0	22	19	3	12	34
Major Field Departmental	259	0	0	259	259	0	77	336
Total	359	33	7	399	359	33	120	512

*Three student members presently attend as courtesy extended by President Enarson.

IV SELECTION OF STUDENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The committee decided that the responsibility for selection of student members for the various faculty committees should rest with students.

Therefore it is recommended that a Student Appointment Board be created immediately to handle this assignment. This Board shall consist of nine members including four day division students, two evening division students, and one student from each Academic Center. The appointment terms of members shall be for one year and shall be made by the appropriate student governing body. Upon the establishment of an all university student governing body the power of appointment of Board members shall be transferred to it. The chairman of the Board shall serve a one year term, and the chairmanship shall rotate among the various student governing bodies. The first chairman shall be a day student.

The Board shall be completely free in developing the criteria for evaluating the individual applicants within the framework recommended by this ad hoc committee. However the Board, when placing students, should seek to maintain adequate diversity among the students placed in terms of their academic division, college, and experience in student organizations.

The Board shall have the following powers and duties:

1. To hold at least two open meetings per quarter in addition to executive meetings.

2. To maintain a confidential file of interested and qualified students.

3. To establish its own operating rules and procedures.

4. To have the sole power to place students on and remove students for cause from all Faculty Council and college committees on which student participation is recommended in this report.

5. To insure that the recommendations of the ad hoc committee with respect to department committees are carried out.

The Student Affairs Committee shall act as an appellate board regarding the fitness of students placed on the recommended committees. If a student is deemed unqualified by the Student Affairs Committee, he will not be placed on a faculty committee and a request by that committee for another candidate shall be made to the Student Appointment Board.

Students who are appointed for a two year term shall be reviewed by the Student Appointment Board at the end of the first year and if doing satisfactorily will be allowed to complete their second year.

Students or faculty may request the Student Appointment Board to replace a student for cause in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. The Board shall decide if the student should be replaced. A student may appeal the decision through appropriate channels.

The Chairman of the Board shall ensure that a student liaison officer is from each committee. He shall report to the various student governing bodies, when appropriate, of the current proceedings of his committee. In cases where more than one student is on a committee, the students of that committee shall select a member to act as their liaison officer. When an <u>all</u> university student governing body has been established the liaison officers shall make their reports to that body. An appropriate time for reports is either when the liaison officer or the executive committee of a council requests a report.

The student governing bodies shall have the power to remove a member from the appointment board upon majority agreement of the five governing bodies. A student may appeal the decision through appropriate channels. Upon the establishment of an all university student governing body, the removal of an Appointment Board member shall be accomplished by a majority vote of that body. A student may appeal the decision through appropriate channels.

The Board shall publish a progress report on the role of students in the governance of their university at the end of each academic year. Copies of the report shall be made available to students, faculty, and administration during the Fall quarter.

V EVALUATION

At the end of one year the Faculty Council shall designate an appropriate committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the recommendations as adopted in this report.

APPENDIX "A"

Survey of Student Involvement

in the

Governance of Universities

PART I

Number of questionnaires sent 66
Number of responses 43
Usable responses were received from the following 36 institutions:

The University of Akron
University of Alabama
University of Arkansas
Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Central State University
Columbia University
University of Chicago
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
Indiana University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
University of Maine
University of Massachusetts - Amherst
University of Minnesota
University of Nebraska at Omaha
New York University
City College of the City University of New York
State University of New York at Buffalo
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Oberlin
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
University of Pittsburgh
Purdue University
University of South Carolina
University of Southern California
Stanford University
University of Texas at Austin
The University of Utah
Washington State University
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Yale College
Youngstown University

PART II

1. Are you in process of rethinking student involvement in university affairs?

Yes 31 No 3* No Answer 2

a. What areas?

	No. of Institutions
All Administrative & Faculty committees	11
Academic &/or Curricular	7
Student Affairs	5
Administrative	2
Departmental	2
Selection Procedures for Committee Membership	2
Buildings & Grounds	1
Student Discipline	1
Financial	1
Board of Trustees	1
Advisory-Type	1

b. Why?

Univ. of Wisc. "Milwaukee"

"the functioning of these committees will be improved by thoughts and voices of students. It is rare that students want to "run" a school but they want to participate in its being run."

Yale College

"1. Student demands.
2. Appointive process considered undemocratic; direct elections often cumbersome and treated with indifference by students."

Akron

"University is interested in greater student involvement in areas where the student by reason of ability, interest, and experience can make contributions."

*These three institutions have revised their policies on the involvement of students in the governance of their universities within the past 2 years.

Arkansas

"to give students more open participation in the affairs of the University."

Bowling Green

"1. To relate goals of the University to students' interests, aptitudes, ability, and motivation.
2. To assist in directing student energies into constructive changes in methods, procedures, and plans.
3. To get a "fresh" viewpoint about our goals, methods, and achievement."

Central State

"Student involvement has been strongly requested and urged by student government."

Columbia

"The experience of this past year 'strongly' indicates the desire of students."

Maine

"need more feed-back."

Kent State

"Recognizing the maturity of today's student, realizing that the student is an integral part of the University community and should share in decision making, and as a means of evaluating, updating, and strengthening the University from the point of view of students."

Ohio State University

"concerns and interests expressed by students."

Oberlin College

"Although the range of opportunities for student-faculty communication is already broad, student participation in faculty meetings could create an important new point of contact. Also, it would be a useful means of informing students about the issues which regularly come before the faculty, and about the manner in which the Faculty treats them. The chances for misunderstanding through misinformation and hearsay would be reduced.

Oberlin College Continued

The competence of students, is admittedly different in kind from the professional competence of faculty members. Students can, however, provide information, suggestions, and opinions of value to faculty deliberations. Experience with students on faculty committees, especially the College Educational Plans and Policies Committee, supports this view, as does the specific occasions. The student viewpoint, as expressed by students themselves joining in faculty debate, would widen and clarify the range of views before the Faculty, and would aid in the reaching of wise and durable decisions.

Student participation would regularize the representation of an important constituency in our academic community and would be no threat to parliamentary decorum. Rather than increase the probability or frequency of confrontations, it is more likely to encourage a greater sense of understanding, responsibility, and consent in student attitudes toward decisions reached in faculty meetings.

Student participants in no way involves an acceptance of the principle of parity. The present preponderance of the teaching faculty in the decisions of its meetings would not be significantly reduced by the participation of a small number of students."

Univ. of Massachusetts

"As a matter of basic operating policy, we are committed to involving students in as wide a range of curricular and extra-curricular policy making and advisory capacities as is reasonable and appropriate."

Boston University

"We believe that the student must be a free participant member of the university community, and as such, he must have the rights and responsibilities incumbent in that membership.

By participant member, we mean one who interacts cooperatively with other members in matters of governance, and one who has a role of effective influence in the community. While recognizing the great variety of forms of participation in such a large and complex community as a university, we emphasize the principle of shared responsibility. We accept the principle that there may be some areas of primary responsibility in the hands of a particular group, but there are no exclusive domains of power and authority where community interest is involved."

City College of The City Univ. of N.Y.

"By definition, there is a difference between a student, a faculty member, and an officer of administration, a difference which derives from the purpose of each in being at the college. The student comes to college to learn - sometimes to be taught. The faculty member is here to facilitate learning - to teach, to research, and to serve. The administrator is here to minister to the needs of all. From these somewhat different purposes and the functions appropriate to each, the role of each derives.

This does not mean that the student is to be treated as a child, with the college standing in loco parentis. While the college may make its own parietal rules, the student should have a voice in the making. Likewise, as a learner rather than a teacher, the student's voice in determining the curriculum and methods of instruction is different from that of the instructor; but that voice should be heard effectively and considered carefully.

When the respective roles have been differentiated, that does not mean that decisions as to what should be taught and how it should be taught, what should be learned and how, and how the resources of the college should be apportioned or programs emphasized, should be made without regard to the desires and interests and demands of students. On the contrary, it is precisely the student who is best able to assess the satisfactory or unsatisfactory feeling-tone of his experience as a learner; and feeling-tone is of the essence of motivation, basic to learning. Impressions and judgments regarding the curriculum and instruction can become valuable aids in restructuring both - as this campus has already learned."

Stanford University*

"When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university.

Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness.

*The 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards and Colleges.

Stanford University Continued

The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students.

It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities:

1. To be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views,

2. freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation,

3. the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and

4. the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution."

Temple University

"Students have a unique awareness of their needs and the effectiveness of the University program in meeting them. While such awareness may sometimes be dim and confused, it has over-riding importance because it is immediate and intensely personal. It extends beyond the classroom to many facets of the university experience and it must be clarified and voiced effectively when policies are made and appraised. Otherwise, a vital element of the policy-making process will be lacking and decisions will be the poorer. There is considerable expertise in the student body which should be cultivated and utilized. Political capabilities, psychological and sociological insight, and technical proficiency enable the student to serve the university; his experience in the university prepares him to serve the nation."

Oklahoma State Univ.

"Students can make significant contributions and they are seeking meaningful involvement. We believe this involvement is necessary but it should be shared among students, faculty and administrators."

University of Pittsburgh

"because we have not evaluated our present system and degree of student involvement for several years. We believe student involvement in University Government is vital for sound decision making and wish to provide for broad and significant involvement."

Purdue University

"Suggested new methods of University governance are reviewed with the aim of finding and adopting those methods which have the promise of improving the operation of the University."

University of Nebraska

"Students can and should contribute."

State Univ. of N.Y. at Buffalo

"Because of a conviction widely shared throughout this campus, that students have much more to contribute to deliberation and decision making - at least where the results directly affect them and their welfare - than they have traditionally been invited to make, because of the inhospitability of the formal structure of most universities toward student participation."

Utah State University

"To determine whether students should be appointed to them."

3. Has student involvement in your committee structure in areas listed below added significantly to the governance of your institution.

	Yes	No
Curriculum	13	4
Finance	5	9
Teaching	10	6
Physical Planning	11	6
Others		
Social Regulations	6	
Co-curricular Act.	1	
Athletics	1	
Educational Services	1	
Library	1	

4. Evaluative Comments

Univ. of Wisc. - Milwaukee

"want more students involved in committee deliberations and possibly fewer committees."

Yale

"Students have become a major, constructive force for change in recent years. Their membership on standing committees has not been divisive, but productive and informative, and, perhaps, most important, an excellent means of goodwill."

Bowling Green

"Student participation, as does faculty participation, requires more time before decisions are reached, but the enthusiastic support for agreed upon procedures more than compensates for the time."

Central State

"Student participants on committees and on the faculty senate have participated on a non-voting basis to date. They are free to involve in dialogue and to make suggestions. This has given them a sense of involvement which, we feel, has contributed to some degree of harmony."

Iowa

"Establishment of University-wide Faculty Senate and broadening of student government's role two years ago has significantly improved governance through joint consultation. Sometimes, however, faculty and students are so anxious to demonstrate their separatness and distinctiveness that collaboration is extremely difficult to achieve."

Oklahoma State University

"Unfortunately, we have more student participation on administrative and faculty committees than faculty and administrative participation on student committees. We are also in the process of studying this area of concern."

State Univ. of N.Y. at Buffalo

"There is a great need to identify and develop more effective and durable forms of student participation in a broad range of actions and decisions. A major obstacle, at all institutions, is the short duration of - and the changing leadership patterns within - each student generation. There is also a need, which we are now assessing, to develop a framework for joint student-faculty governmental participation - whether through an all-University Senate or some other comprehensive government form."

Utah State Univ.

"We think it is significant that students be involved whether they make a contribution or not, that to have them be a source of communication to and from the committees is the important thing."

Univ. of N. Carolina

"We are very pleased with the contributions that students are making in all of these areas of concern, and contemplate continuing and expanding their involvement in the governance of the University."

PART III

COMPOSITION OF FACULTY STANDING COMMITTEES WITH STUDENT REPRESENTATION

	No. of Committees with Student Representation	No. of Representatives				% of Representation			
		Stud.	Adm.	Fac.	Total	Stud.	Adm.	Fac.	Total
21 Institutions	180	557	383	1,469	2,409	23.1%	15.9%	61.0%	100.0%
4 Institutions	46	152	287		439	34.6%	65.4%		100.0%
25 Institutions	226	709	2,139		2,848	24.9%	75.1%		100.0%

					Student Role			
					Voting		Non-Voting	
					No.	%	No.	%
6 Institutions	73	168	?	?	831	94.8	46	5.2
31 Institutions	299	877						

PART IV

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SPECIFIC FACULTY COMMITTEES

Committee Area	Number of Institutions	Institutions with Student Representatives on Committees		Stud. Representatives		Student Role	
		No.	%	Total No.	Avg. per Committee	Number Voting	Number Non-Voting
1. Curricular	31	13	42	39	3.0	31	8
2. Admissions and/or Standards	31	10	32	23	2.3	21	2
3. Financial Aid	31	16	52	43	2.7	40	3
4. Faculty Affairs	31	2	6	3	1.5	0	3

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

4-7-70